REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. In the above referenced Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Chrisop (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0043638). The rejection has been traversed and, as such, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the allowability of claims 1-20.

2. Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Chrisop. The applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection and the reasoning thereof.

Chrisop does not teach or suggest a dynamic buffer allocation, but does teach a mechanism for a user to manually allocate RAM within a multiple function device. In particular, Chrisop teaches, in paragraph 12, that [t]his invention provides a user interface, such as a front panel or web page, that permits a user, at boot time, to fine tune the RAM memory allocated for each component. {emphasis added}

Chrisop further teaches, in paragraph 23, that [t]he system 100 comprises an interface 102 to provide RAM allocation prompts, and an allocator 104 to allocate RAM for MFP functions in response to interface prompts. {emphasis added} Chrisop further teaches, in paragraph 24, that [t]he allocator 104 allocates RAM for MFP functions for either MFP components or MFP features, in response to interface 102 prompts. {emphasis added}

Chrisop also teaches, in paragraph 32, that [t]he present invention system permits a user to have control over the memory distribution for each of the major components in the system. The user has a front panel or web page interface into the system to set the amount of memory that will be allocated at system boot time. {emphasis added} Limits may be imposed on these allocations based on the amount of installed memory and/or the minimum memory required for operation of a individual component. However, any flexibility between these ranges is up to the user of the device.

Chrisop teaches, in paragraph 36, that FIG. 4 is a flowchart illustrating the present invention method for adaptively allocating RAM in an MFP device with a plurality of components. … The method starts at Step 400. Step 402 supplies an interface. Step 404, in response to interface prompts, selects the allocation of RAM for MFP functions. Selecting the allocation of RAM for MFP functions includes selecting RAM for MFP components and MFP features. {emphasis added}

Chrisop teaches, in paragraph 39, that [s]upplying an interface in Step 402 includes supplying a graphical user interface (GUI) to present RAM allocation options. Then, selecting the allocation of RAM for MFP functions in response to interface prompts in Step 404 includes allocating portions of RAM in response to GUI prompts.

Chrisop teaches, in paragraph 29, that FIG. 3 is an exemplary front panel GUI, such as might be seen by a user selecting an allocation of RAM for an MFP device.

From these passages of Chrisop, the system of Chrisop provides an interface that allows a user to select the amount of memory, within limits, allocated to the various feature and/or components of the system. As such, the user makes the determination of how much memory to allocate to each of the components and/or features of the system. The system of Chrisop processes the memory allocation to each of the components. In addition, regardless of which component or feature is actively processing a document, memory is allocated to the various components and/or features in accordance with the allocation by the user.

With respect to claim 1, Chrisop does not teach or suggest determining a mode of operation of the multiple function integrated circuit and identifying at least one active module of a plurality of modules of the multiple function integrated circuit requiring a buffer based on the mode of operation. Chrisop instead teaches, as reference above, allocating memory as determined by the user to each component of the system. (See Figure 3 and paragraphs 29-31 of Chrisop.)

Further, Chrisop does not teach or suggest determining buffer requirements for the at least one active module and allocating memory space of the shared memory based on the requirements. Instead, Chrisop teaches, as referenced above, that a human makes the determination of memory allocation for each of the features or components of the system. Once the human has made the determination, the system processes the user inputs to allocate the memory.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant believes that claim 1 overcomes the present rejection.

Claims 2-6 are dependent upon claim 1 and introduce additional patentable subject matter. The applicant believes that the reasons that distinguish claim 1 over the present rejection are applicable in distinguishing claims 2-6 over the same rejection.

The applicant believes that the same arguments that distinguish claim 1 over the present rejection are applicable in distinguishing claims 7 and 14 over the same rejection. In addition, claims 8-13 and 15-20 are dependent upon claims 7 and 14, respectively, and introduce additional patentable subject matter. The applicant believes that the reasons that distinguish claims 7 and 14 over the present rejection are applicable in distinguishing claims 8-13 and 15-20 over the same rejection.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant believes that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that they be passed to allowance.

The Applicant hereby rescinds any disclaimer of claim scope made in the parent application or any predecessor application in relation to the instant application. The Examiner is advised that any such previous disclaimer and the prior art that it was made to avoid, may need to be revisited. Further, the claims in the instant application may be broader than those of a parent application. Moreover, the Examiner should also be advised that any disclaimer made in the instant application should not be read into or against the parent application.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present invention.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: /Timothy W. Markison reg. 33,534/
Timothy W. Markison
Phone: (808) 665-1725
Fax No. (808) 665-1728

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

37 C.F.R 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Alexandria, Virginia 22313, on the date below:

Date Signature